the caption 'Zia threat to go nuclear' wherein President Zia-Ul-Haq of Pakistan has said 'India is for all practical purposes in the Soviet Camp';

(b) if so, whether Government have lodged any protest with the Pakistan Government in this regard;

(c) if so, the outcome thereof, and

(d) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K NATWAR SINGH): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

(d) India's credentials as a non-aligned country are universally recognised. Assertions to the contrary do not make them any the less valid

Law to debar persons supporting Sati from contesting elections

3639 SHRIMATI KRISHNA KAUL: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to debar any one who supports 'Sati' from contesting elections by amending electoral law; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ): (a) and (b) A proposal that the preaching or glorification of sati should be made a 'Corrupt practice' under Section 123 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 is under consideration of the Government.

Payment of productivity linked bonus to FADs

3640. SHRI ASHWANI KUMAR: Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the civilians of FADs and the civilians of ASCs are not alike;

(b) whether the orders/instructions issued for ACSs are not *mutatis mutandis* applicable to that of FADs employees;

(c) Whether it is a fact that the civilians of FADs had won the case from the court of law to get productivity linked bonus w.e.f. 1980 and onwards i.e. equivalent to the PLB paid to ASCs employees; and

(d) if so, what are the reasons for which FADs employees have not been paid PLB bonus for the year 1986-87, at par with ASCs employees?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI K C PANT): (a) No, Sir.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Some employees of 23 FAD had won a Court case for payment of PLB with effect from 1980 and onwards. The amount of PLB admissible under the rules was paid to the concerned employees. The employees have gone again to the Court and the matter is sub-judice ASC employees are paid ad-hoc bonus and not PLB.

(d) Does not arise.

Representation to Union in Defence installations

3641. SHRI ASHWANI KUMAR: Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) what are the JCM IV Levels Rules in Defence Installations for giving representations to the Unions where one recognised union, affiliated to either of the two recognised Federations, is functioning;

(b) whether there is a provision to give only two seats to the above referred Union; if so, whether the remaining seats would be allotted to non-recognised Union, not affiliated to either of the two Federations but fulfilling the conditions of recognition; and

(c) if not, whether the balance seats would be filled up by giving representation to the branches of All India Associations functioning there?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE PRODUCTION AND SUPPLIES IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI SHIVRAJ PATIL): (a) A copy of the relevant rules is attached. [*See* Appendix CXLIV, Annexure No 152].

(b) Yes, Sir. Out of the remaining four seats, two seats will be filled through election by the workers' representatives in the Works Committee, and two seats may be allotted to the other recognised Union.

(c) The duly constituted Branch of a Staff Association of Defence Civilians, which has been granted recognition on an All India basis and is functioning in that Establishment, will be taken to be recognised for purposes of representation at the Fourth Level Council of that Establishment. However, if the particular Staff Association is already represented in the appropriate Third Level Council, it will not be given representation at the Fourth Level Council.

Disparities in the pay scales of employees of unit run canteens and CSD employees

3642 SHRI M. KADHARSHA: Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to refer to answer to Unstarred Question 3983 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 27th August, 1987 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there are disparities among the pay scales of employees of unit run canteens and C S D employees;

(b) if so, what are the details thereof, and

(c) what steps Government propose to take to remove the disparities among them and also among the canteens run by the different commands and unit of the Air Force?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI K C. PANT): (a) and (b) The employees of the CSD are Government employees and their pay scales are the same as those of Government employees. The employees of the Unit-run canteens, on the other hand, are private employees of the concerned Unit-run canteen. Their pay and allowances are settled mutually between them and the management of the Unit-run canteen and vary from canteen to canteen. As the latter are not Government employees, it would be incorrect to refer to the differences in their pay structures *inter-se*, or vis-a-vis those of Government employees, as "disparities"

(c) As the employees of the Unit-run canteens are private employees of the concerned canteens, their pay and allowances are not determined by the Government

3643. [*Transferred to the 8th December*, 1987].

P.M. accused of committing atrocities on Sikhs

3644. SHRI KAPIL VERMA.
SHRIMATI VEENA VERMA
SHRI DHARAM CHANDER PRASHANT:

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a Sikh group published in the "Washington Post" on October 19, during Prime Minister's visit last month, the signatures of Nine U S. Congressmen, including a majority democratic whip, accusing the Prime Minister of committing atrocities against Sikhs;

(b) if so, whether the nine U.S. Congressmen have since then in a letter to the Chairman of a Sikh foundation, accused the Sikh group of misrepresenting their stand and using their names under false pretences; and